

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending and under consideration.

ITEMS 1-5: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 -5 FOR ANTICIPATION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102 BY RODE ET AL. (U.S. 2002/0007409)

Claims 1-5 are rejected by the Examiner as being allegedly anticipated by Rode.

According to aspects of the present invention upon a client making a request to a server, the server confirms a display status of a client side, for example, by transmitting an HTML document embedded with a serial number for confirmation. As a result, a status of confirmation information data of a client side coinciding with a server side is confirmed. (See, for example, FIG. 3 and page 12, starting at line 4). The present invention increases the ability of a server to recognize a page referred to by a client, and reduces problems due to double registration or double ordering. (See, for example pages 1-2 starting at line 20). The present invention reduces unnecessary access to a server thereby increasing operation speed.

The cited art Rode, on the other had, only teaches storing account information by a "pay-in-advance." (See, for example, Rode paragraph [0061]). The Examiner cites a sequence taught by Rode in paragraph [0061] as teaching features of the present invention. (action at pages 2-7). Applicants submit, however, that Rode merely teaches (paragraph [0061]):

(t)o prevent the same cookie from being resubmitted, a timestamp is encoded in the cookie data that will expire within a few seconds of when the cookie is first sent to the browser.

Traverse

As provided in MPEP §706.02 entitled Rejection on Prior Art, anticipation requires that the reference must teach every aspect of a claimed invention. Rode does not support an anticipatory-type rejection because it does not describe features recited in the present application's independent claims.

Affixing Means For Affixing Confirmation Information For Confirming Display Status Not Described by Rode

Independent claims 1 and 5 recite, respectively, a server for performing a process in compliance with a request from a client, and a computer-readable recording medium storing a program causing the computer to function as affixing means for affixing confirmation information for confirming display status of a client side to a result of process performed by a processing means.

The Examiner contends this feature is taught by Rode paragraph [0061] that describes a sequence that "redirect(s) browser to new URL (which causes retransmission of cookie)." (Action at page 2).

Applicant submits that this redirection is understood in the art as not teaching an affixing means and Rode does not teach in the lines cited by the Examiner, or elsewhere, an affixing means for affixing confirmation information.

Storing Means For Storing Affixed Confirmation information Not Described By Rode

Claims 1 and 5 further recite storing means for storing the confirmation information affixed by the affixing means.

The Examiner contends this feature is taught by Rode in paragraph [0040]. (Action at page 3). However, Rode merely teaches (paragraph [0040]):

(i) it is therefore an object of the present invention to store information about Client-User use of Server resources on the Client (in Client Storage) so to be accessible to a single or multiplicity of Servers without requiring a central database.

Rode does not teach a storing means for storing confirmation information.

Transmitting Result Of Process Having Confirmation Information Affixed To Client Which Made Request Not Described By Rode

Claims 1 and 5 recite transmitting a result of a process having the confirmation information affixed thereto by the affixing means to the client which has made the request.

The Examiner contends this feature is taught by Rode in paragraph [0079]. (Action at page 3). However, Rode merely teaches (paragraph [0079]):

a new account cookie is created and transmitted in an HTTP header along with a (l)ocation.

Rode does not teach confirmation information for confirming display status of the client side is transmitted to the client that made the request.

Extracting Means, Responsive To Request Made Again From Client For Extracting Confirmation Information In Request Not Described By Rode

Claims 1 and 5 further recite extracting means, responsive to a request made again from a client, for extracting the confirmation information included in the request.

The Examiner contends this feature is also taught by Rode in paragraph [0061] that :

4) compare(s) newly updated cookie against account and staleness limits, 5) if OK, process(es) operation.

Applicant submits that Rode does not teach in the lines cited by the Examiner, or elsewhere, an extracting means response to a request t made again from the client.

Determining Means Determining Whether Confirmation Information Extracted By Extracting Means Coincides With Stored Confirmation Not Described By Rode

Claims 1 and 5 further recite determining means for determining whether or not the confirmation information extracted by the extracting means coincides with the confirmation

Ser. No.: 09/714,234

information stored in said storing means.

The Examiner contends this feature is taught by Rode (paragraph 0061):

(i) it is possible that the operation could fail through no fault of the user, and in such case the account information could be credited to reflect such failure.

Applicant submits that nothing whatsoever in the lines cited by the Examiner, or elsewhere in Rode, teaches determining whether extracted confirmation information coincides with stored confirmation information.

Withholding Means For Withholding Process In Compliance With Request If It Is Judged Two Sets Of Confirmation Information Do Not Coincide Not Described By Rode

Claims 1 and 5 further recite withholding means for withholding a process performed by the processing means in compliance with the request if it is judged by the determining means that the two sets of confirmation information do not coincide.

The Examiner again contends this feature is taught by Rode (paragraph 0061) that only teaches:

(i) it is possible that the operation could fail through no fault of the user, and in such case the account information could be credited to reflect such failure

(Action at page 4).

Applicant submits again that nothing whatsoever in the lines cited by the Examiner, or elsewhere in Rode, teaches withholding means for withholding a process performed by the said processing means in compliance with the request if it is judged by said determining means that the two sets of confirmation information do not coincide.

Conclusion

Since features of independent claims 1 and 5, and claims 2-4 dependent on claim 1, are not taught by the cited art, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn and claims 1-5 allowed.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Ser. No.: 09/714,234

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 21, 2004

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on June 21, 2004
STAAS & HALSEY
By: Kathleen Brooks
Date June 21, 2004